LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

JOINT COMMISSION

APPOINTED TO ARRANGE FOR A

WORLD CONFERENCE

ON

FAITH AND ORDER

"Ινα πάντες ἓν ὦσι, καθὼς σύ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἓν ὦσιν, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

Ut omnes unum sint, sicut tu Pater in me, et ego in te, ut et ipsi in nobis unum sint, ut credat mundus, quia tu me misisti.

That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.

THE
MANIFESTATION OF UNITY

By the Rt. Rev. C. P. Anderson, D.D.
BISHOP OF CHICAGO

THE MANIFESTATION OF UNITY*

By the Rt. Rev. C. P. Anderson, D.D.
bishop of chicago

[*This paper is deemed worthy of publication by the Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church on a World Conference on Faith and Order, which, however, does not hold itself responsible for any statement or opinion herein expressed.*]

Dear Brethren of the Clergy and of the Laity:

GRACE be to you and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

Two years ago I addressed you on "Catholicity and Unity." Let me return to the same subject again, and consider it from another angle.

Unity is the will of Christ. Unity is a fundamental dogma of the Christian religion. The interior unity of the Church of Christ is an established spiritual fact. The manifestation of this unity is the duty of Christ's disciples.

* *A charge to the Annual Convention of the Diocese of Chicago, May 28, 1912.*

Christ's agonizing prayer was "that they all may be one: even as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may believe that Thou didst send me." "I in them and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into one." The burden of our Lord's prayer was for the accomplishment of the will of God, and for the fruit of His own sacrifice in the establishment of unity and in its manifestation amongst His disciples. It was a manifested unity for which Christ prayed. "That they may be one" was the prayer. "Even as we are one" is the foundation of the prayer. "I in them and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into one, that the world may know that Thou didst send Me, and lovedst them even as Thou lovedst Me." There is a unity to be believed in, as well as a unity to be exhibited to the world. It is important to keep this in mind. It is essential to realize

that the interior unity of the Church is a divine, imperishable reality, and that our task is not to make unity, but *to make it manifest.* Extraordinary results are promised from this manifestation of unity. There *is* unity, but the world cannot see it. There *is* unity, but the world does not believe it. Our part is to coöperate with God and yield to the strivings of the Holy Spirit, so that the unity of the Church will be actualized and visualized in such corporate manner that the world can see it with its own eyes, and seeing it, will believe in the power and love of God.

Unity and Union

It is quite common to contrast unity and union as though a choice had to be made between them. The words are not synonymous, by any means; neither are they mutually exclusive. It is well to define one's terms. God makes unity. Man makes union. There might

be union without unity. There might be a union of churches which would be vastly different from the unity of the Church. Nevertheless, unity can be shown forth to the world only through union. Under present circumstances unity means the union of the churches in the Church. It means that the whole Church encompasses and contains and controls all that pertains to it. It means that each church shall be visibly incorporated into the whole Church and that the whole shall be clearly the property of each. It means that the tree claims the branches because the branches claim the tree. It means that the life of the tree and of the branches is so clearly one life that no one thinks of asking whether the life-giving sap can reach the remotest leaf of the farthest twig. It means that each baptized man is conscious of his membership in the one Church, and that his membership is immediate and

direct and not derived through his membership in some subsidiary organization. It means that instead of a man saying, "I am a member of the invisible Church because I belong to one of the visible churches," he will say, "I belong to the One visible Church because there are no visible churches." It means that the churches as such may lose their identity in order that the Church may preserve *its* identity.

Unity and Catholicity

I speak as a Churchman, as a Catholic, as a Christian. Do I need, does any Christian man need, any other terms to define my religion or his? God is my Father; the Church is my Mother. Christian is my name; Catholic is my surname. Do we need any other names? Why go on to add Anglican, Episcopalian, Roman, Protestant, Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregationalist, Baptist, and so on, and so on? These

terms are divisive, sectarian, narrow. They shrivel up one's soul. Names stand for realities. The realities of religion are its affirmations, not its protests and its negations. The universal positives of religion are mine. The whole sweep of Christian doctrine, the whole field of spiritual experience, the whole world of religious values, the whole story of Christian triumph, in every age and in every clime, are mine, because I give my whole allegiance to the whole Church, and not to a mere segment of it. Will not every Christian man in these days claim the same thing? If, then, every duly baptized man claims to be nothing less than a member of the Catholic Church (a claim that has the sanction of sound theology), why not begin to plan to give outward and visible expression to this inward spiritual reality? Why seek to perpetuate division and segregation, except to thwart the will of God, to

feed our own pride, and to defeat the power of the Church of Christ? Christians, Churchmen, Catholics! Christians because of our discipleship to Christ; Churchmen because we are incorporated into His mystical Body; Catholics because we belong to nothing less than the Church universal. These are the inclusive, the comprehensive, the unifying terms. Cling to them, dear brethren, cling to them, and make them truly expressive of your religion. So long as there is a drop of denominationalism or sectarianism in men's blood, it will block the manifestation of unity. God never made Protestant Episcopalians, — nor Presbyterians, nor Congregationalists, nor any of sectarian name. He made Christians, and they chose to call themselves by less lovely names. "We receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock and do sign him with the sign of the cross." That is your only Church,

and that is the sign by which you are known. Realize with all your might the universality of your religion. Impress it upon your minds and upon the minds of others. When men begin to realize what true Catholicity is, they will seek ways of making it apparent that they belong to the whole Church and not merely to some segregation of Christians whose connection with the parent body is not apparent to the world.

Unity does not involve Surrender

The Christian unity programme need not awaken any suspicion of surrender or of the sacrifice of honor, as the diplomatists would say. Rightly understood, it means that each gains all and loses nothing. It is a matter of relating things, —of relating the churches to each other, and to the Church. Every man recognizes that each church has done much for the souls of men. Every fair-minded

student puts a high estimate on those thrilling movements that enliven the pages of Church history. Those movements and the churches which grew out of them have played their part in the progress of the world. Battles have been fought and won. Battles have been won, not for the conquering churches, but for the Church of God. They were battles and movements within the bosom of Christendom itself. But the battles are over. They cannot be fought again. The Reformation has taken place. Protestantism has arrived. Luther, Calvin, Wesley, have lived. The world is different because these things have happened and these men lived. But the Church cannot live on its past conflicts. It cannot acquiesce in an armed truce as a permanent attitude. It has firmly resolved not to perpetuate internecine war. What, then, is to be the next movement in Christendom? Is it not to correlate and to coördinate these values

which each church has proclaimed at great cost and for the stewardship of which it is keenly conscious? Since the Reformation the Christian religion has been subjected to disintegrating analyses. Men have taken it apart to ascertain what each jewel in the setting was like. Has not the time come to put them together again in a beautiful mosaic? Truths are not isolated. They are related. They are one. Modern creeds and articles and confessions may be admitted to be true. If true, they are related. Or rather they are true only when related. It is no discourtesy to any church to suggest that the time has come to abandon this analytical process by which the Church has been disintegrated and to substitute for it a synthetic process, by which the churches will be related. Harmonize the values. Synthesize the theologies. Stop fighting these oft-won battles over again. Cease these interminable logomachies.

Strive towards that manifestation of visible unity that will bring defeat to none and victory to all.

Unity and Conservatism

The Christian unity propaganda is not radical nor destructive. It is constructive conservatism. It conserves the original constitution of the Church. Let us suppose that you are reading the New Testament for the first time, without any presuppositions based upon modern conditions in Christendom. You read "on this rock I will build my Church." "Tell it to the Church." "The Church, which is His body." "He is the head of the Body, the Church." "The Church of the Thessalonians," and so on. Here the Church is one. It is a Body. It is visible. Now take your eyes off the Bible and look around. Does the bewildering multiplicity of churches fit into the Bible conception of the Church? Leave out for the present the form and

organization of the Church. The point to be pressed is that the New Testament is strong on the doctrine of the Church, but knows nothing whatever of the modern idea of churches. Polychurchism is as foreign to the New Testament as polytheism. The "churches" of the New Testament are geographical congregations of the Church. It is true that the sect germ threatened to invade the Church even in those early days, but it was anathematized as a sin of the flesh. "Now this I mean, that each one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided?" "I beseech you that there be no divisions among you." This very schism which St. Paul characterized as carnal sin has become triumphantly rampant in our time. When one saith, I am of Rome; and another, I of Canterbury, and I of Geneva, and I of Luther, and I of Wesley, are we not carnal and walk as

men? The reunion of Christendom, then, is not a perilous pursuit. It would heal wounds, build up the Body, and restore that unity which characterized the Church when she first set out to win the world for Christ.

Visible Unity an Economic Necessity

The union of the churches in the Church is becoming an economic necessity. The economic argument might, of course, be easily overworked. Money does not weigh much over against conscience. Nevertheless, the economic argument derives weight from the fact that divisions are proving to be as economically unsound as they are theologically unsafe. God uses political and financial situations for the furtherance of His will. Unlovely complications have often ushered in great movements. Hard facts are demonstrating that Christ's doctrine of unity is the only workable doctrine in this practical

work-a-day world. It is being proved up to the hilt that the churches cannot do the work of the Church.

Take the missionary situation. What does the non-Christian know or care about our ecclesiastical differences? When a Presbyterian minister in India complained that his greatest difficulty consisted in teaching his converts the difference between the established Church of Scotland and the Free Kirk, he should have been retired as a man who did not know his business, or else those august bodies should have relieved him of his embarrassment by abolishing the distinction. When an Anglican Dean could not offer up special prayers in time of a sudden calamity because the rubric made no provision for such an emergency, and his Bishop was not on hand to authorize special prayers, it raised the question as to whether the stiffness of Anglican uniformity does not need some lim-

bering in the interest of spiritual unity. When a "Christian" minister told me that there could be no union apart from immersion, it made me feel the importance of distinguishing between a fact and its expression, between regeneration and its sign, between a man and his clothes. And when men take their stereotyped idiosyncrasies into foreign lands and back them up with an ecclesiastical organization, it raises the question as to whether the best way to save the heathen's soul is to confuse his wits.

Why should the non-Christian be contaminated with inter-denominational controversies, especially in the kindergarten stage of his Christian education? Why should he be told anything about those family quarrels of ours out of which the Thirty-nine Articles, the Westminster Confession, the Augsburg Confession, and all the sects of Christendom have sprung? It has been said that Japan never had

a gas age. It leaped from kerosene to electricity. Let it leap into the full light of a united Church without passing through an ecclesiastical gas age. St. Paul revolutionized a continent with one Church and one short creed. Is it not enough to take to Asia and Africa the same religion that he took to Europe? Either the missionary enterprise will have to make some short cuts which will startle us here at home, or else the Churches must anticipate the missionaries by putting up a more solid front. The united Church can preach a fuller Gospel, provide more men to preach it, and do it with a more economic expenditure of God's money, than can the aggregate of all the churches. The choice in non-Christian lands must be between Christ and some other master, between the Church and the world, between the Church and no church. It cannot be wise to compel them to make a choice

between churches. If it be said that the missionary propaganda minimizes or conceals the ecclesiastical differences, then they are either wrong in doing so, or else we are wrong in maintaining those diverse organizations whose differences our agents have to conceal in the interest of a truer Christianity.

The economic argument applies at home as well as abroad. Take some practical illustrations. There is a city of fifteen hundred souls — men, women, and children — in the Diocese of Chicago. That city has nine churches. Some of these nine are supported by home missionary boards, and get more than they give. Allowing five to a family, each one of these churches would have about thirty-three families. By actual count, about 50 per cent of the heads of families do not belong to any of the nine, though they are by no means antagonistic to the Christian religion. Is it strange that men find it difficult

to make a choice, and that they cut the Gordian knot by choosing none? Not one of those churches is strong enough to beget self-respect, nor to command allegiance. Not one of them, nor all of them put together, can be regarded as a worthy exponent of the Christian religion. The churches have dethroned the Church. That's what has happened. Compare the situation in that Illinois city with the New Testament idea of the Church. St. Paul wrote a letter to "the Church of God which is at Corinth," and the Church got it and read it. If one of St. Paul's successors were to send a letter to the Church of God which is at this particular city in Illinois (or any other city in the United States), who would get it? Probably no one. The Church of God is so obscured by the churches that the postmaster couldn't find it. He couldn't see the woods for the trees. Down in Indiana there is a village of

two hundred inhabitants. It has six churches. One wonders if it has any Christianity. These are of course aggravated cases, but approximately they represent a state of affairs in hundreds of small cities and villages in the United States. Is it Christian? Is it statesmanlike? Is it good religion? Is it good business? No, it is a sin and a shame. Our many church labels are proving to be libels against Christianity, and many religions are not increasing religion.

Then, too, if many places are over-churched, others are unchurched. There are rural communities and many villages and small cities that have neither church nor chapel, priest nor preacher, mass nor meeting, Sunday-school nor catechism. That is true in the southern part of our own state. It is not because they are not Christians, but because they are sectarians. They cannot have five or ten churches and

so they have none. Come right home here to the environments of Chicago. There are communities on the outskirts of this city, with either no community church, or with churches supported by missionary boards and supporting none. Many religious bodies are trying to meet this situation, both at home and abroad, by some sort of gentlemen's agreement under which it is sought to avoid overlapping. This is good. There would seem to be no reason why those denominations which are scarcely distinguishable from each other should not adopt some such plan, at least as a temporary measure. As a permanent policy it is open to two grave objections. It acquiesces in divisions and it deprives the people of the privilege of being anything else than sectarians. It seems to say that divisions are bad, but must stay. Worse still, it dooms certain sections to a narrow Christianity. No denomination-

alist claims that his denomination is the whole Church. Consequently the division of territory would establish a sectarian rather than a Catholic Christianity. Yes, there may be temporary expedients, but there can be only one permanent policy—the reunion of Christendom.

Unity a Social Necessity

Visible unity is a necessity from the viewpoint of social efficiency. A sectarian Christianity cannot mould the social conscience. It is incapable of a catholic cosmopolitanism. It cannot act continentally. After all, sectarianism is only one remove from individualism, and individualism is incompatible with organized Christianity. If there can be five churches, there can be five hundred or five thousand, or as many churches as there are individuals. Hence the premise which admits of many churches carries one on logi-

cally to no church. Now this is not Christianity. Christianity is not only a religion for individuals, it is for society. It is a social religion. It is a Kingdom, a Body, an Organism. The world is the subject of redemption. Society itself is to be regenerated. The nations are to bow before Christ.

It is commonly supposed that the function of the Church is to convert individual men to Christ. Yes, it is that, but it is more than that. It is commonly supposed that the function of the Church is to be the good Samaritan to those that are fallen by the wayside. Of course it is all that, but it is more than that. Its function is to clear the highways — the industrial, the social, the political highways — of thieves and robbers, and not simply to be the good Samaritan to those that have been knocked down and robbed. Its function is to bring about the new earth in which dwelleth righteousness, to be the exe-

cutive agency of God's Kingdom of righteousness and peace and joy. Men sometimes say that if the Church converts individuals, society will take care of itself. The individual must of course be converted, but that is not enough. Every stone in the building may be perfect, and yet if they had not been put together properly, they might have fallen down over men's heads. Individuals may be good, and yet society may be badly constructed. Society is something more than the aggregate of its individuals. The Church is infinitely more than the aggregate of its churches or of its individuals. Life is an organism. The Church is an organism. Therefore individualism is not the gospel for this world. The world is organized. Money is organized. Labor is organized. Society is organized. Politics are organized. Even the nations of the world are beginning to organize internationalism. Everything is organized

except the Christian religion, and Christ prayed that that would be organized. As things stand now, it is an unequal fight between an organized world and a disorganized Church. A disunited, disjointed, individualistic Christianity, where every church and every man is an independent unit, cannot stand up against the highly organized conditions of to-day. This was well recognized by "The Federal Council of Churches in America," when it put these words in its platform: "Christ's mission is not merely to reform society, but to save it. He is more than the world's Re-adjuster. He is its Redeemer. . . . At no time have the disadvantages of the sectarian divisions of the Church been more apparent than when the call has come for a common policy or a united utterance." Those are wise words. The powers that make for unrighteousness, the powers that corrupt legislatures, that promote intemperance, that thrive

on lust, that threaten the judiciary, that oppress the hireling, are solid and compact. They sink differences for a common cause. Against them the churches have a common creed, but an uncommonly unorganized method of defence. They are beating the air. The powers that make for unrighteousness can mock at righteousness as they say to the churches, "United *we* stand; divided *you* fall."

Indeed, it has come to pass that a large part of the work of the churches must perforce be taken away from them, in order to avoid denominational entanglements. When men are moved to do something in the name of God and humanity for the city or nation, they feel compelled to make it a non-Church and a non-religious enterprise. Denominationalism is too incoherent for a social programme. True, the gospel of Christ supplies the spiritual conviction, but when that convic-

tion takes concrete shape, it somehow seems to have to divorce itself from the source of its inspiration. Thus there are settlements, leagues, associations, organizations, doing the work of Christ, but forced to do it, forsooth, on a non-religious basis. Thus they lose ideals, inspiration, spiritual power. Thus the things that God hath joined together are being forced apart through the disintegration of His Church. For reform without religion is the mere whitewashing of the surface. Society needs regeneration, not simply reformation. And any man who thinks that social regeneration can be accomplished apart from the power of the Spirit of God, speaking through His Church, is living in a fool's paradise. Grasp the situation, brethren. It is this, that the Church of Christ is in danger of losing its power of utterance. Amidst the jargon of voices its voice can scarcely be heard.

Or let us suppose that it is determined to organize some public charity or to inaugurate some uplift movement. You are sure that it has the sanction of Christ and of all good men. What happens? The first move is to proclaim from the house-tops that it is undenominational and non-sectarian. It is Christian, clearly enough, but nevertheless it has to be dissociated from churches, in order to express the consciousness of the Church. In one way this is a travesty on churches. In another way it is eloquent for good. It means that Christ's work refuses to come under sectarian lines. Christ's work is as catholic as human needs. It requires for its execution nothing smaller than a Catholic Church.

Or take the matter of Christian education. Surely this is fundamental if anything is. Our divisions have made it impracticable. They have separated into two the things that are one, viz.,

religion and education. Education has been as completely secularized as if man had no soul, and the world had no God. Religion has been as completely isolated as if character had no place in a child's education. Our education is losing its religious values. Our religion is losing its educational values. Christian ideals and principles cannot be woven into the warp and woof of the lives of our own children, as a part of their schooling, simply because of the divisions in the Church. To my mind there are three great problems to be worked out amongst Christian people in the interest of a permanent Christianity. They are Christian education, Christian social righteousness, and Christian unity. I believe the first two await the third.

Unity a National Necessity

Christian unity is necessary to give organic expression to the religious life

of the nation. The Catholic Church is world-wide, but just because it is Catholic, it is also national in tone and temper. We love to call this a Christian nation, yet we shrink from attempting to define what American Christianity is. The United States has millions of Christians and scores of churches, without a Christianity that is distinctively her own. Latin Christianity we know. It took possession of the Latin nations and moulded their religious life. Scotch Christianity we know. Perhaps there never was a religion which sank more deeply into a nation's mind than Presbyterianism did in Scotland. English Christianity we know. It made England. It built her national and domestic life. But what is American Christianity? Is it not largely an importation? It is one thing to inherit Christianity in its essence; it is another to import foreign characteristics. We have imported certain national types which

took their form and shape in other lands—an Italian Christianity from Italy, Lutheranism from Germany, Anglicanism from England, Presbyterianism from Scotland, Orientalism from Asia Minor. Proud of our own originality, impatient of tradition, our religion is nevertheless an heterogeneous conglomeration of imported traditions. Every kind of church can be found here. Here are all the elements of ecumenicity. Here they are side by side, yet they know not one another. Are they incurably incompatible? Is there nothing to look forward to except the permanent establishment of foreign types on American soil? Centuries ago England blended diverse peoples and religions into one Church and nation. What has been done can be done. Here in America, where churches are politically equal, where all the churches of Christendom are housed under the same national roof—here the problem of unity

must be worked out, if anywhere. The nation has a problem similar to that of the Church. She gathers her people from the four quarters of the globe and makes staunch Americans of them. She brings order out of chaos, and makes one from many. Is the nation stronger than God? Has the Church of the living God become so weakened through disorganization that she is incapable of bringing her American children into the united Church of the United States? Is there not to be a Catholicism that will express the religious life of America, as Americanism expresses her national life? Surely there is something better in store for us than a condition of chronic chaos. Go back once more to your New Testament for a description of the Church that once was and that may be again: "That we may be no longer children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine . . . but speaking truth in

love, may grow up in all things into Him, Who is the Head, even Christ; from Whom all the Body, fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part maketh the increase of the body, unto the building up of itself in love." That is what is meant by unity. The Church is fitly framed and knit together. What a contrast there is between the Church of the ages and the churches of this age.

Brethren, the reunion of Christendom is the future task of the churches. In working at this task, let us be sure of a right start. Christ is the head. The Church is His Body. Christians are united to Christ through membership in His Body. Here is an indestructible unity at the outset—unity in the one Lord through the one baptism; the unity of a common membership, a common discipleship, and a common expe-

rience. That unity exists in spite of all the sects of Christendom and all the powers of hell. Magnify it. Proclaim it. Manifest it. It is not our business to make unity. God has done that. It is our business to make it apparent. It is ours to try to bring ourselves and others into such visible unity in the One Church of Christ, that an unbelieving world will be convinced. Am I succeeding in persuading you to any extent that the Christian unity enterprise is more than an academic theory; that it is the will of Christ; that it is a matter of practical efficiency; and that loyalty to Christ and service to the world combine to make our duty clear? If you come with me this far, then let me venture to point out some simple ways of creating an atmosphere in which unity will have a chance to show itself.

1. Let us confess the sin of schism — the sin, I say; not simply its economic disadvantage, its short-sighted policy, its unstatesmanlike method, its unstrategic warfare with the world, but its *sin*.

2. Let us confess our part in the sin. It is easy to confess sin in the abstract. What is needed is an honest though humiliating acknowledgment of our part in the making and in the perpetuating of schism. We have much to confess — haughtiness, aloofness, self-satisfaction, false witness against our neighbors.

3. Let us cease confessing other people's sins. We Anglicans have confessed the sins of the Roman Catholics and the Protestants with great ardor and with unstinted fullness. Let them confess their own. It will keep them busy. We are not authorized to do it for them. We are forbidden to judge

others and commanded to judge ourselves. Rome's contribution to the sin of schism may have been incalculably great. Protestant contributions may have been incalculably many. But our own skirts are not clean by any means. Please God they and we may see the sinfulness of our sins some day and humbly confess it. Thankful may that church be, to which God gives the grace to be the first to cry, Peccavi. Until the churches are convicted of sin, as our Methodist brethren would say, there will be little progress towards the manifestation of unity.

4. Let us learn to play fair, and, if we have to fight, to fight fair. We are familiar with those pulpit pictures and polemic brochures, wherein are vividly portrayed the horrors of Rome, the heresies of dissent, and the unsullied beauty of the Anglican Communion. Of course we have no monopoly of that ungenerous business, but it would

be to our profit to get out of it entirely. Teach the Catholic faith positively. To do this requires no negatives and no anathemas. A whole library of lies could be extracted from the controversial literature of Christian churches. What false witness against their neighbors has been given by pious Papists, pious Protestants, and pious Protestant Episcopalians. Let us learn to tell the truth and to play fair; and to fight fair, if we have to fight at all.

5. Let us put the best possible interpretation upon the beliefs and practices of others. Assume that the things that mean nothing to us mean much to their advocates. Let us try to get the point of view of the other man for the sake of the enrichment of our own minds. Let me illustrate. Because the angry dispute of some centuries ago, over the relation of the Bishop of Rome to the Church of England, was settled to our satisfaction, are we to

go on aggravating the rupture by talking and acting as though the Papacy is and always has been unalterably bad, and as though no place could be found for it in the constitution of the United Church of the future? The Papacy must be better than its enemies think it is, or else the world has had many brilliant fools. Because the Methodists left us for reasons which do us no credit, are we to go on estimating Methodism at its worst, as if it stood for nothing that would be worth while in the life of the Catholic Church of the future? Methodism must be something better than some people think it is, or it would not have brought so many thousands nearer to their God. Because bishop-baiting Covenanters and lordly prelates lost their tempers a long time ago and called each other unspeakable names, are we to go on, now that things have cooled down, as if reconciliation were impossible, and

as if Presbyterian theology were wholly foreign to the Catholic faith? Presbyterianism must be more than some of us have thought, else it would not have captivated the minds and dominated the lives of a strong intellectual people. Estimate people at their best. Try to see what they see. Be careful to put your own best foot forward, so that the Church of your allegiance will be seen — not at its worst. This lesson has been impressed upon me afresh through a considerable correspondence on Church Unity with representatives of many churches. Amongst my correspondents have been some candid friends who write with brutal frankness about the Episcopal Church. Dear brethren, if the Anglican Communion were the wood, hay, and stubble that my friends think it is, you and I would n't be where we are. Now it may be that this shoe fits the other foot also.

Please do not misunderstand me. It would be foolish and shallow to talk as if there were no serious difficulties and differences in the way of visible unity. There are. There are. There are different premises. There are different conceptions of what the Church of Christ is. There are fixed habits of mind in great variety. We press on towards the reunion of Christendom, not because it is in sight, but because we have a passion for unity—a passion that is based upon our loyalty to Christ and a desire to do good in the world. No one sees much daylight ahead as yet. We cannot see the distant scene, and we can take but one step at a time. But we feel sure that that one step is in the right direction if it leads us to think highly of the things of others.

6. Let us lend our influence in the promotion of frank and friendly conferences on our differences. A World

Conference of this sort has been proposed, as you know. It may come soon or late—or never. It would come too soon if it came before the churches were convinced of the necessity for union, or of the practicability of such a conference in promoting it. More important than the Conference itself would be the spirit in which it assembled. Let us cultivate that charity and that love of personal contact, without which a conference might rekindle controversy. On some other occasion I may say more about the scope and purpose of the Conference plan. In the meantime give your sympathy and cooperation to such measures as make for friendly and unhostile contact.

7. Let us aim high. Let us not be afraid to place organic unity before us as the goal, and let us not despair of comprising all Christendom within it. There may be intermediate steps to be taken, but they are steps on a journey,

not stopping-places. Interdenominationalism may do some good in places where it does no harm. So far it seems only to have pronounced its blessing on a state of division which it deplores. Federation may do much good where it is workable. Its great value seems to be the witness that it bears to the necessity of something more than federation. Coöperation in good works is absolutely necessary so far as it is practicable between churches which come at things in directly opposite ways. But, brethren, organic unity has in it all that these "flickering expedients" have, and infinitely more. The greater includes the less, but the less does not include the greater. Interdenominationalism, federation, the coöperation of unattached bodies, have just enough merit in them to be tantalizing, but not enough merit to warrant their advocates in devoting precious time to their promotion. They have this merit, that

they indicate that men no longer apotheosize divisions, and that they are beginning to dream of better things. While we are at it, let us aim to reach the goal that Christ set up, namely, visible unity.

And let us take in the whole sweep of Christendom, Catholic and Protestant. It may take a long time. It may have to come one step at a time, through the union of those that are most closely related. But every such union is to be regarded as a step towards the realization of that one holy catholic apostolic Church—"fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners."

8. Let us pray for the manifestation of unity. Christ prayed for it. So must we. It is easy to talk about it. It is easier still to cry Hurrah, and clap our hands when others talk about it. But we must get beyond the talking stage into the praying stage and doing stage.

In this case praying will be doing. Take it to the altar with you. It is around the altar that unity must be manifested. It is at the foot of the altar that we shall learn the will of God. When Christians the world over voice their passion for unity at the Mass and in the prayer-meeting, something wonderful will surely happen. Nothing less than this will win the day. The spirit of separatism is that kind of a spirit that can be cast out of the Church by nothing—save by prayer.

LOOK down, O Lord, upon Thy poor dismembered Church, rent and torn with discord and even ready to sink. We will hope, O Lord, that notwithstanding all supposed impossibilities, Thou wilt one day in mercy look down upon Thy Sion, and grant a gracious interview of friends so long divided. Thou that wroughtest that great reconciliation between God and man, is Thine arm waxen shorter? Was it possible to reconcile God to man? To reconcile man to man, is it impossible? Direct Thy Church, O Lord, in all her petition for peace. Teach her wherein her peace consists, and warn her from the world, and bring her home to Thee; that all those that love Thy peace may at last have the reward of the sons of peace, and reign with Thee in Thy kingdom of peace forever. Amen.

Prayer of John Hales (died 1656).

AT the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America in 1910, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, There is to-day among all Christian people a growing desire for the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer that all His disciples may be one; that the world may believe that God has sent Him: RESOLVED,

That a Joint Commission be appointed to bring about a Conference for the consideration of questions touching Faith and Order, and that all Christian Communions throughout the world which confess our Lord JESUS CHRIST as God and Saviour be asked to unite with us in arranging for and conducting such a Conference. The Commission shall consist of seven Bishops, appointed by the Chairman of the House of Bishops, and seven Presbyters and seven Laymen, appointed by the President of the House of Deputies, and shall have power to add to its number and to fill any vacancies occurring before the next General Convention.

¶

Copies of this leaflet may be had free on application to the Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Maine, U.S.A., who will also enter on the mailing list those who signify to him, with their post-office addresses, a desire to receive the publications which the Commission expects to issue from time to time.

¶

Contributions for the expenses of the Commission and the Conference may be sent to the Treasurer, George Zabriskie, 49 Wall Street, New York, U.S.A.

3 0112 059258522